DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 461 176 EA 031 498

AUTHOR Howley, Craig
TITLE School Administration and Globalization.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 73p.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Awareness; Cultural Relevance; Culturally Relevant Education; Developed Nations; Economic Change; *Economic Factors; *Economic Impact; Educational Economics; Elementary Secondary Education; *School Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Globalization

ABSTRACT

This document discusses globalization as a worldwide economic process and its impact on school administration. Globalization is about economics, which is a perpetual concern of school administrators. Actions that take place across the world can have significant direct and indirect effects on schools and school districts. The history of globalization is looked at as a continuation of economic development with roots in 15th century colonialism and imperialism. Examples are given that demonstrate globalization's ability to devalue local cultures and traditional education by imposing homogenizing practices such as high-stakes testing and school accountability. School leaders need to consider the extent to which school reforms are driven by the agenda of globalization, need to listen carefully to the rhetoric of globalization in which so many reform efforts are couched, and need to ask difficult questions about the way local schooling works to prepare students to conduct maximally thoughtful lives. A case study is presented involving a monthly meeting of four principals with a superintendent to illustrate the impact of globalization on local educational practices. The paper concludes with a list of resources. (Contains 52 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 461 176

School Administration and Globalization

Craig Howley

Ohio University
Athens, OH 45710

Chapter 13 from a cancelled textbook project
December, 2001

Note. The authors (including Aimee Howley, Catherine Glascock, Jerry Johnson, and Jim Williams) developed 5 of 12 chapters before this project was cancelled by mutual agreement with the publisher, on which cancellation all rights reverted to the authors. The textbook was planned to introduce masters-level school administration students to "alternative perspeectives" on leading schools, one of which perspectives addressed globalization. Other perspectives (for instance) included feminimism, communitarianism, and ethnic bases of leadership.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Howley
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 031498

School Administration and Globalization

Introduction

The word "globalization" first appeared at the end of the Second World War, but its usage became much more common following the end of the Cold War. Most of us have probably paid very little attention to the rather sudden infiltration of this word into our minds, but he connections between globalization and school leadership are nonetheless momentous. That's the reason for this chapter.

The sudden infiltration and accompanying lack of attention given this word are part of the danger the concept poses for educators. In fact, our own lack of attention to its meaning suggests that we are all implicated in glossing over some troubling realities with this positive-sounding word. Whether or not the word is a fad, the phenomenon it signals will remain an influence on educational thinking and in schools and communities well into the future (Spring, 1998).

Globalization is about economics, in large measure, and economics is a perpetual concern of school administrators. Levies of various sorts and the business administration of schools and districts (not to mention state systems of schooling) are constantly in the news and constantly occupy the attention of school officials. But the local economic events (levies, changes in the funding formula, equity litigation) that impact schools and communities are not isolated from the economics of the "big picture."

Today, however, "the big picture" in economics extends not just to the nation as a whole ("macroeconomics") but to global proportions. Both the volume of international trade and its speed have increased radically in the past decade (Bauman, 1998). More deals made on a

worldwide scale, and made more rapidly, spell faster and more intense changes for local communities worldwide, but perhaps most particularly in "developed nations" like the United States.

The tiny rural community of Buffalo, West Virginia, for instance, maintained a small but excellent high school enrolling just 250 or 300 students for a long time. The state capital was just barely within commuting distance, and the community was stable, though isolated from the population center of the school district. Then a prominent U.S. Senator brokered a deal with Toyota motors. The deal established an engine assembly plant at Buffalo, and the community was subsequently and rapidly remade in many ways. One of the results of this development, perhaps ironically, was the planned closing of the excellent little school. Was this a boon or disaster for the school? For the district? For the community? The answers depend on how one sees the issues and where one's commitments lie. The governor and the senator of course announced a grand victory.

Beginning to understand the world economic system is tremendously important for local school administrators. Globalization, or more properly, the world economic system, exerts uneven influence in local communities throughout the U.S.—sometimes for good and sometimes for ill. Sometimes, as when a manufacturing plant relocates to another nation, hundreds or thousands of jobs *vanish*, and the effect translates rapidly and disastrously to local schools. But, as in Buffalo, West Virginia, even the acquisition of more jobs than there are adult workers available locally can subvert the integrity of a community, and the death of its school might be one feature of that subversion.

The relevant questions for school administrators might include the following: Who will

live here? Who will pay taxes? Will the local economy improve or get worse? Will "improvement" mean a greater disparity between rich and poor or will it mean greater equality? What sorts of people and organizations exert power locally? Is this changing? How? What position should I take? What are the risks and possible benefits of this position?

It's of course important that superintendents ponder these questions, but the questions are equally important to school principals because, as Dennis Dunklee advises, principals need to look to district-level concerns to understand sources of support and challenge: "Effective principals start by looking at the bigger picture" (Dunklee, 2000, p. 22).

This chapter presents one of the biggest pictures of all that right now impacts local schools, districts, and communities. What is globalization? Is it a "theory," like feminism or critical theory, or does it describe a phenomenon happening in the world? Are there different versions of globalization? Which do we hear most often? Why? What do those different versions mean about how we think about schooling and school administration? What choices can we make? Which ones should we make?

This chapter aims to help prospective administrators *think* critically about these questions and the ensuing choices. Like the other chapters, it doesn't prescribe what to think or what to do, but helps readers ask questions and formulate their own answers. To do this, the chapter regards the claims made by powerful interests with a degree of scientific doubt: it tries to look behind or around such claims to glimpse alternative accounts and perhaps some partial truths.

Finally, readers who believe that capitalism is an ideal economic system will surely find much to approve in globalization. Thoughtful capitalists, however, have wondered whether or not globalization itself poses challenges so difficult that global economic catastrophe is

inevitable (see, e.g., Soros, 1998). Whatever one's political and economic persuasions, it's easy to see that the results of radically changing political, economic, and cultural institutions could make the 21st century much less secure for the developed world than has been the case for the past 50 years.

What Is "Globalization"?

Questions need to be asked because most commonly we hear just one, very superficial, account of globalization. In the usual reference to it, globalization is something inevitable that is transforming national economics and world cultures to bring people into closer contact—particularly into closer trading contact. For instance, former president Bill Clinton, addressing the World Trade Organization[1] in 1999, spoke for many business leaders when he said,

> [Globalization] will be about jobs, development and broadly shared prosperity; and about improving the quality of life, as well as the quality of work around the world; an expanded system of rule-based trade that keeps pace with the changing global economy and the changing global society. ("Rise of Globalism" section, ¶ 1)

But this isn't necessarily or inevitably so. Zygmunt Bauman, a Polish sociologist, claims that in common usage, the word "globalization" has turned into "a no-questions-asked canon" (Bauman, 1998, p. 1). He means that *globalization* is a word that's used to shut people up, not to help them think.

---

[1] The World Trade Organization (WTO) was formerly known as the "General Agreement on Trade and Tarriffs" (GATT). The change in name is meaningful: an agreement governing trade among nations has become a planetary *organization*.

The problem, according to Bauman, is that "what appears as globalization for some means localization for others...[and] being local in a globalized world is a sign of social deprivation and degradation" (p. 2). This sobering assessment grates against the rosy images and strong imperatives issued in praise of globalization by international corporate and political leaders.

Whom should one believe? Bauman advises his readers that it's more important to ask lots of questions about globalization than to settle on *any* premature answers, especially those being sold to the public by politicians and spokespersons of transnational mega-businesses. This note of caution is rarely heard by educators, because it's seldom articulated by the politicians and business leaders who translated rhetoric about worldwide change into policies that affect schools. These leaders, nevertheless, disregard any role that educators might play in making sense of globalization. Instead, they regard management of the threats of globalization as the province of experts "owned" by them (see, e.g., Lasch, 1995).

Defining "Globalization"

Clearly, globalization indicates many things—different things—to different people. In this chapter, however, we want to focus on globalization as *the post-industrial worldwide manifestation of free trade under neo-liberal economic rules*. Thinkers as different as Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Zygmunt Bauman would likely find this formulation acceptable. Let's start by unpacking the definition.

First, we're talking about a way of doing business. "Neo-liberal economic rules" refers simply to contemporary capitalism: the rights, privileges, expectations, and conventions of trade

conducted so as to maximize private profit. Profit is surplus capital, some of which is retained by owners (stockholders) and some of which is returned to expand a company's operations. The emphasis in this setup is on individual rights, but more particularly in the contemporary world, on *corporate* rights.

Second, we're talking about *advanced* capitalism. In some accounts (e.g., Hobsbawm, 1962), the birth of capitalism took place in Britain about 1700, as the capital accumulations of wealthy merchants met the emerging industrial era. At that time, wealth became something more than a hoard of valuable items ("riches"); it began to have implications for economic development—for, as Adam Smith had it in 1776, increasing the "wealth of nations." Unlimited growth was the vision and method of capitalism, as compared to earlier economic systems (mercantilism, feudalism) in which use of wealth meant *using it up*. By contrast to mere wealth, "capital" indicates a resource that *increases itself without limit* (Heilbroner & Thurow, 1985).

From a corporate perspective, however, *advanced capitalism*, by contrast with the *early capitalism* of Adam Smith, is not just a national, but a *trans*national phenomenon. "*Trans*national" differs from "*inter*national" in that corporations operate not just between national borders—from one nation into another, but across all national borders, and in-and-out of national boundaries from moment to moment. The identities of transnational corporations, conducting business in this way (as they do by definition), are not bound to any particular nation. In the era of globalization, the new work of national governments (see, e.g., Sassen, 1996) is to guarantee transnational corporate rights through a regime of transnational laws and agreements, and to maintain order within their own particular boundaries (where transnational firms, after all, must eventually do one business deal after another).

Third, advanced capitalism is *post-industrial*. Capitalism developed industry, and so it was initially a post-agrarian phenomenon, though, of course, agricultural production actually continued. In fact, in order to supply the food needs of an expanding population, capitalism accelerated agricultural production (on the factory model) while simultaneously employing far fewer people (reducing the number of farmers dramatically between 1870 and 1970). Similarly, a post-industrial capitalism doesn't do away with industry, it is instead employing fewer and fewer people in industry and doing so with a declining profit margin (as happened to agriculture). Computer-based enterprises arguably lead economic growth (and market volatility) today, but the real engines of transnational corporate growth lie within the infrastructure of international finance (Sassen, 1996). That infrastructure is partly a digital telecommunications infrastructure—people, skills, machines, and software; and partly it is the previously mentioned regime of transnational trade agreements and related institutions.

Fourth, and last, the part of the definition people usually grasp intuitively is "worldwide manifestation." Globalization indicates a planetary phenomenon. We all "get the point." Let's rephrase it, however, in light of the above: This post-industrial, digitally speeded transnational corporate capitalism is at constant work throughout the world, remaking rural and urban zones with effective haste. This worldwide manifestation is part of a long history, but many observers have concluded that the events of the past several decades mark a point of qualitative difference (Bauman, 1998; Sassen, 1996).

Schooling and Remaking the World.

Momentous economic and political events *remake the world*. Who remakes the

world—and to what ends—are issues that are critically salient to education in the era of globalization. Who benefits most? Who's in charge? What kind of world are they creating? What role do schools play? What roles should they play? If educators fail to ask such questions, they will accept almost any answers provided by powerful people and institutions that believe in their own economically-given right to remake the world (see Sidebar 1). In this scheme schools have less to do with education proper (or with sustaining a democracy) and more to do with social reproduction (and following the plan of powerful business leaders).

Sidebar 1

The New Continental Order

Imagine that you are living in the country of Meer. A brutal regime--rulers of the nation of FiX--has occupied the country after an invasion. Your nation is not the first nor will it be the last to fall to the imperial ambitions of the FiXers.

Now, the national leadership of your nation have not merely declared a cease-fire, or given an outright surrender, but they have instead negotiated an armistice that removes them from the ranks of nations hostile to the FiXers. Other nations are being attacked, just like Meer, but the armistice between Meer and the FiXers voids the mutual-defense pacts that your country, Meer, had signed with these other nations.

You're an ordinary person, not a scholar, not a wide reader, and you're a patriot. You're also a school principal. You accept national authority, and the newly appointed

leader in Meer really is a national hero, well respected, and well liked. He saved the nation before and he can do it again, you believe. He's at least worth listening to very carefully.

The new and revered leader of Meer promises that the errors that led to Meer's defeat can be blamed on a certain class of people. They will be properly dealt with. Moreover, the future will be better. Beginning right now, new youth programs will be organized to instill the virtues of discipline, order, and respect for authority. Workers will be sent to FiX to establish "fraternal relations"—to get "FiXed." Improvements will take time, the great leader says, but when the revitalized Meer emerges from the rubble, it will stand as "a full partner of the new cross-continental union" being established by the FiXers. The schools have a special role to play in preparing workers for the new cross-continental economy. "We must prepare our youth to compete in a cross-continental economy!"

This educational message is repeated in many ways from day to day, and month to month. It's all you see on television, all you hear on the radio, and all you read in the educational magazines and journals. You're skeptical, of course. Though you don't like the FiXers, they are very polite and give seats on buses to old people and pregnant women. In the end, you believe that Meer's great leader knows what he's doing. Besides, politics is not really your concern. A new continental order is coming, so why not prepare kids to be part of it? It just makes sense, you think, to prepare kids for the

real world.

This fable is the thinly disguised story of France under Nazi occupation in the Second World War, as told by Marcel Ophuls (1971) in his classic documentary, *The Sorrow and the Pity*.

As in the United States circa 1940, "National Socialism" (the Nazi organization and ideal) had supporters in France. According to Ophuls, most average French people *easily* entertained the idea that the Third Reich might dominate Europe and even the world. Many—perhaps most—were content to let their leaders articulate a post-war place for them in the empire to be established by Hitler's military-industrial-complex.

Ophuls's documentary makes a very critical point about French resistance to the Nazi regime: Members of the resistance (a small minority of the French people) tended not to have much to lose; they were most often workers or, in the words of one interviewee, "failures and maladjusted people." The middle-classes (teachers, shopkeepers, professionals) did not usually take the risk of active resistance. They had too much to lose. The deepest inference to be made from Ophuls's film, however, is that most citizens in most nations would react much as the French did in 1940-1945—their story is not in fact exceptional, but *typical*.

What's the point for us? We *believe* the stories we hear *most often*—life is difficult, our days make us bone-tired in the best of circumstances, and it's easy not to question too much. A world is painted for us in bold colors, with all sorts of hidden implications. Every repetition makes that world seem more acceptable, more certain, and indeed, at last, *inevitable*.

If school leaders cannot think about matters like educational purpose, diversity, the role of nations, and the mischief done by propaganda in everyday life, they're apt to treat mention of "globalization" with the same attention accorded to "fluoridation": *It's in the water and doing good things for us.* Watching Ophuls's film, though, can help one better appreciate the fact that passive acceptance of official stories is a always mistake. (see the resource section at the end of the chapter for more information about the film).

Listen, for instance, to this "official story" from New Jersey's core curriculum content standards:

> We live in an age of exploding knowledge and rapid change in technology, information exchange, and communications. The changes which are taking place in our society have increased the demand for internationally competitive workers and for an educational system designed to meet that demand....To gain and retain high-wage employment that provides job satisfaction, they will also need to continue to learn throughout their lives. To compete in a global, information-based economy, the students we prepare must be able to solve real problems, reason effectively, and make logical connections. The world of work they enter will feature products and factories that are designed by mathematical models and computer simulations, computers that control production processes and plants, and robots. Our state and country need people with the skills to develop and manage these new technologies. (New Jersey Department of Education, 1996, "The Need" ¶ 1-2)

What are people for in this view? They are competitors in a globalized economy, rather than citizens exercising political rights and making choices about democratic institutions. Schools, it seems, should help redesign people to "manage new technologies." If diversity counts in this picture, it comes into play only as teachers and administrators contrive to make sure that all children (whatever their ethnicity, place of residence, or social class) conform to this intended redesign. Ultimately, after many repetitions of similar statements, readers or listeners

become less likely to ask embarrassing questions or insist on the chance to examine issues. This chapter encourages prospective school leaders to start asking embarrassing questions, as occasions arise—and they *will* definitely arise. *Our world is, after all, being remade.* Asking embarrassing questions at the right times is in fact one hallmark of a good leader.

Teaching the Commons (a Policy Vignette)

Clearly, the world is being remade according to perceptions about the "economic need" of the coming century, and educators are being told that preparing *individuals* to be maximally competitive in the workplace should be their primary aim. Is this the best we can do? Aren't there *public* purposes, rather than only individual purposes, on which educators should focus their primary efforts? Instead of teaching competitiveness, what about teaching service to the common good ("the commons")? There are possible alternatives to the emphasis on competitiveness and individualism, but they receive little official attention or support (Theobald, 1997).

"The commons" may be an unfamiliar phrase to readers, and that's too bad. It has implications for educational policy that school administrator must understand. Traditionally, "the commons" refers to physical space outdoors (the public land on which livestock graze, for instance) or indoors (for example, an area accessible to all students, for sitting, eating, or socializing). Recently, it has been used to refer to those services, such as public education, that serve the common good. In a related meaning, the phrase, however, also refers to a body of knowledge that advances the common interest of the public. For instance, in the language of recent reform efforts, "the commons" might be "what all children [or all workers] must know and

be able to do."

There are, however, many alternatives to the specific state and national listings of "what all children must know and be able to do," though one seldom hears of them any longer. Indeed, it's difficult to think of any others, once you've heard this phrase. "All children must" appears to embody two qualities highly prized by educators: equality ("all") and high standards ("must").

This sort of common knowledge, however, is promoted today not at all for its contribution to the common good, but, as noted above, for its private usefulness among individuals and corporations. What's wrong with that?

For one thing, we simply *cannot* tell what the future bodes for society as a whole, let alone for each individual. We're accepting a prediction about the world of the future when we accept definitions of "what all children must know and be able to do" related to vague assertions about the future. Good jobs have always been in short supply, and there is very little reason, on the basis of historical evidence, to suspect that "all children" will have access to great jobs (see the New Jersey standards, above) even if they go to school for a long time and do very well in their course work. In fact, it's downright unlikely. For another thing, business leaders think ought to constitute knowledge and kills for all students is not what everybody thinks. Labor leaders or local community members might well hold very different views.

A far more faithful version of the commons bases its sense of "all" and "must" in community rather than in the individual or the corporation. Of particular importance in this conception (Theobald, 1997) is not just "community" in the abstract, but the *actual local community* whose children attend a *particular* school (see chapter 6). In some versions of what schooling is for, sustaining and developing the local community (rather than mostly the nation or

mostly the global economy) is paramount. This version of schooling contributes actively to a local common good that people can see and engage with their own eyes and bodies, rather than the remote and unknown but nonetheless rosy future promised by politicians and CEOs of transnational businesses.

What about standards? Isn't it ridiculous to think that local communities can develop their own standards for their own schools? Who has the time for that? Curiously, there is an example of how that might work. The Annenberg Rural Challenge (now known as the Rural School and Community Trust), concerned for the one-size-fits-all version of standards, has published a policy paper on community-based standards (Annenberg Rural Challenge, 1999). According to the Trust, "Whose Standards Matter?" is a critical question:

> Students should internalize the highest standards of excellence in the pursuit of knowledge and in the development of the judgment needed to apply that knowledge. These standards should originate within the community in which the student lives; they should be used to measure the student's achievement and the school's performance; they should be widely shared and understood by all members of the community; and they should be both explicit and comprehensible to lay people. Standards should include the broader learning standards of a fully developed community with an educational mission to help all people develop their intellectual capacity. The process of adopting standards is itself important because it can both strengthen content and increase public acceptance of those standards. The process should be participatory and inclusive, and genuine in both. (1999, p. 59)

The Trust's statement on standards is certainly very different from the one heard most often by educators—the one practiced almost exclusively in contemporary schools, and the one behind so-called high-stakes testing (one manifestation of globalization in public schooling).

Power and School Culture Viewed Internationally

The networking of the world as an economic unit is not so radically new a development as all the recent talk about globalization implies. It actually continues a line of global economic development that runs from the 15th century to the present. Before "globalization," we had "imperialism," and before that "colonialism." All three advance the same project, according to Joel Spring (1998).

In order to understand the role of education under imperialism and colonialism, we need briefly to consider the nature of traditional cultures and traditional education. What we in the US recognize today as "education" is quite different from the education available to ordinary people throughout the world for centuries past.

Traditional Culture, Traditional Education

What we think of as "education" so smugly in the developed world (that is, formal schooling) is nothing like the sorts of education practiced before the emergence of capitalism in Western Europe around 1700. In fact, formal schooling has really achieved universality in the *developed* world only since 1960 or so. In 1900, almost no one went to high school in the United States, for instance. And many people who reached adulthood in the US in the 1930s and 1940s left school well before completing the 8th grade.

In many parts of the developing world, high school attendance is still uncommon. Spring (1998) reports that in colonial Cambodia—in the developing world—the first high school opened its doors in 1933, and by 1954 had graduated just 100 students. Dongping Han (2001) reports that in a Chinese county of 800,000 inhabitants, the only high school operating between 1933 and 1966 had graduated only about 1,000 students during all those 33 years. (Not one of these

thousand, according to Han, returned to their villages after graduation to help sustain and improve their local communities).

In fact, human creatures cannot survive socially or communally without education, whether or not they sponsor much schooling. Humans have an astounding set of tricks for keeping alive and living well, in fortunate and in unfortunate circumstances, and this set of tricks is taught and learned, mostly outside of schools, even today, right here in the U.S. The "tricks" vary rather widely among human cultures, and they change over time as the young innovate. Writing was certainly a good new trick, and it has seemed to require formal schooling, but humans were doubtless weaving, building, plowing, and *problem-solving* at high levels long before schools were possible or mass schooling even dreamt of.

"Education" cannot, then, be synonymous with formal schooling. Even book learning doesn't require school attendance, and many of the West's cultural heroes (like William Faulkner and Albert Einstein) attended school less than one might suspect.

Traditional cultures were, in fact, constituted educationally: The old taught the young. The young learned and often innovated, and taught their children. In the pre-literate world, children probably learned most often as part of the work routines of household and community. They had to learn, because they had to work. And vice versa.

Among others, John Dewey, the great progressive educator, called this "learning by doing," and, about 1900, it seemed like a shocking and radical new idea to use in schools. Though practiced for millennia in traditional cultures worldwide, its practice in classrooms was uncommon.

In fact, the invention of schooling was required to separate education and work. Formal

schooling was a leisure-time activity[2] (not work) devoted to considering the world at arm's length. This separation is not bad, it just characterizes the difference between formal education and traditional education: Formal education is associated with individual leisure, traditional education with communal and family work.

Is this separation necessary today? Tom Tiller is a professor of education in Norway. Tiller (2000) reports that as a child (not so long ago) he attended school in northern Norway only on alternate days. *Every other day was a "day off."*. Tiller's day off was not like *Ferris Buehler's Day Off* (a popular teen caper film of the 1980s):

> We weren't just out of school, we were immersed in life. The day off gave us rich experiences. That day insured that holistic learning occurred in our lives. We were involved in many informal apprentice-master relationships. We young people were invited into important, legitimate learning positions....The other day provided clear space for creativity and excitement. (Tiller, 2000, p. 223)

So, what we (mistakenly!) imagine to be real "education" (formal schooling, preferably for many long years) is an extremely recent development, even in the developed world. Tiller, with savvy irony, observes,

> The "other" day, that is the day we were off from school, was far more important for our lives after graduation than we then realized. *That day off meant that even our school, which seemed only minimally relevant, was comparatively good.* Today, however, school totally dominates the life of our children. This places great demands on the school to provide students with fulfilling life experiences, and it requires new organizational structures. We're approaching an either-or situation: either give back to youth that "other" day, that day off, *or school will lose its meaning and legitimacy* [emphasis added]. (Tiller, 2000, p. 218)

Moreover, when people talk or write knowingly about the importance of education for the developing world—in South America, Asia and Africa—they seldom honor the importance of

---

[2]The word "school" comes from the ancient Greek word "schōle" ("leisure").

traditional culture and traditional education. Instead, the typical recommendation is that these places should imitate formal schooling as practiced in the developed world (the very plan that Tiller understands as threatening to the legitimacy of formal schooling itself!).

This vignette about "the day off" is meant to suggest to readers that the assumption that formal schooling is necessarily a good thing *can* be questioned thoughtfully. What seems self-evident and obvious, in fact, is exactly the thing to question.

Seldom, as well, is the connection made between toxic economies in the developing world (or remote parts of the developed world) and the legacy of colonialism, imperialism, and, now, globalization. In parts of the territory formerly administered by the Soviet Union, for instance, teachers are not paid, and electricity is available to schools only sporadically. A friend of the authors, teaching at a public university a nation formerly in the former Soviet Republic, reports that secondary schooling is a shambles. Privatization, he reports, is the watchword, while public schooling is in actual collapse (personal email communication, February 25, 2001). Our friend writes,

> The president has pronounced that in lieu of money, schools can barter for services ("We'll give you free math lessons for electricity?")! Teachers who are earning from $5-$10 per month (unless they are moonlighting) are allowed in the villages to get [use of] free patches of land to grow vegetables, since they cannot buy them [vegetables]. I kid you not.

Lest we be thoughtlessly smug about this, it's good for us to remember that many of our schools in impoverished urban and rural communities aren't ones we'd want to hold up as world-class models of excellence. Economic chaos can turn formal schooling into a waste of time even within the highly developed heartland of modern society.

In the U.S., American Indians are especially concerned that their schooling honor traditional educational purposes. Indians struggled for most of the 20th century *against* the kind of formal schooling imposed by missionaries and by federal and state governments (Lomawaima, 1999). Since about 1960, however, American Indians have been increasingly successful in pressing their rights to determine their own forms of education. Notable elements of schooling as devised by Indian leaders now include traditional culture and traditional education as well as the subjects needed for negotiating in and with U.S. society. Indian schooling moves forward with its struggle to become bicultural.

Tacit views of what is correct for formal schooling, however, continue to threaten prospects for biculturalism in Indian education. The threats are compounded when schools serving Indians are not tribally controlled (Tippeconnic, 1997). Indeed, the effects of high-stakes-testing and national demands for accountability tend to push issues such as language preservation (a critical mission in Indian education) and local knowledge (important also in rural education) into the deep shadows of curriculum work—in Indian schools and in most other U.S. schools as well (see, e.g., Theobald, 1997; Strike, 1997).

Pluralism in Contrast to Globalization

When European and American colonialism was the scheme that dominated international development—roughly from 1500 to 1900—most of the world was thought, in European and American centers of power, to be populated by largely unknown and certainly outlandish peoples. Their habits, customs, and beliefs stymied and intrigued intellectuals in the colonial "mother" countries. Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* (Swift, 1726/1940) captures, in political

satire, the sense of wonder at the variety of possible human (or, as was often thought, quasi-human) arrangements lurking in the wide, and largely unknown, world of the time. For progressive thinkers like Swift and Jean-Jacques Rousseau (famous for constructing the image of "the noble savage"), this diversity seems to have held potential for advancing the possibilities of human wisdom and justice. For many more others, like the Englishmen Cecil Rhodes (African "empire-builder") and Sir Francis Galton (father of both statistics and gifted education), the world's "savages" needed the civilizing force of European laws and conceptions of individual rights (Spring, 1998), not to mention corporate discipline.

As colonialism advanced its grasp of the non-industrial world, Western intellectuals' fascination continued, though with an increasing pessimism. In the novels of Herman Melville and Joseph Conrad, exotic cultures are settings for European and American misery and confusion. For instance, in Conrad's famous story, *The Heart of Darkness*, written in the early 20th century, Europeans arriving in remote parts of Africa discover their own emptiness, not a realm of new insight and enlightenment. See sidebar 2.

Sidebar 2

Globalization and the Emptiness of Home

Globalization seems to push the emptiness discovered by Conrad's hero in *The Heart of Darkness* to planetary proportions. How does this happen?

A small proportion of the planet's population become "globalized" elites, often traveling back and forth across the planet. Sometimes, these elites have no single home-base, but may

maintain apartments in several global cities (London, Singapore, and New York or Paris, for instance). The rest of the world's population—practically all of us, in other words—is not so much globalized as localized, writes Zygmunt Bauman. Our lives will not be flashy and successful, but increasingly dreary and meaningless, and we will experience sharply and with great envy the contrast between us and the globalized elite. Bauman argues,

> If the new exterritoriality of the elite feels like intoxicating freedom, the territoriality of the rest feels less like home ground, and ever more like prison—all the more humiliating for the obtrusive sight of the others' freedom to move....The "locality" in the new world of high speed is not what the locality used to be at a time when information moved only together with the bodies of its carriers; neither the locality, nor the localized population has much in common with the "local community" [of former times].

Localization, thus viewed, is the dark side of globalization—the side not taken seriously by world leaders in the developed West, nor, in fact by prominent educational leaders. It's important to note, as Bauman does, that this new "localization" is very different from a beloved town or city or countryside, which we might call "home," or in which we might feel that we are in touch with the best life has to offer while at the same time living modestly.

The rising pessimism in modernist novels may have stemmed in part from the increasing knowledge (and declining diversity) of world cultures. As "strange and outlandish" cultures have acquired not only snowmobiles and microwave ovens, but recycled American sit-coms, the seeming mystery and variety of human social forms has contracted into an increasingly common—though hardly universal or ubiquitous—set of experiences worldwide.

Western Education and Colonialism

It's true that cultures have been colliding and mixing for many millennia, of course: the Persians, the Bantus, the Jews, and the Sikhs have roamed continents and the world (Appiah, 1998); all existing languages, including English, are living testimony to this mixing. But during practically all previous time, the time line of this mixing was long—spanning many generations, so that the formerly plural cultures of the planet remained identifiably separate in most people's experience of time. Even knowing of one another's existence was at one time unlikely.

This separation, which seemed nearly absolute before about 1700, has since nearly disappeared. *Colonialism*, that is, the maintenance of colonies throughout the world by European powers (Spain, the Netherlands, France, and most particularly, Britain) ended that separation and in the course of a few centuries remade local economies to serve the "mother" countries. The Industrial Revolution accelerated matters, as colonies were converted from remote sources of valuable imports and into connected markets for manufactured goods.

It's very important to realize that this history produced *colonial administrations* that endured and grew increasingly strong links, between Europe and, starting in the 19th century, the United States. Those administrations and the elite class of people who staffed them *survived* colonial rule. Colonies separated, but colonial administrations endured.

Try to imagine the English ruling India: a section of one tiny island (England) ruling a continental territory (India) many times its size in territory and population, one with a longer and perhaps more complex civilization, and with many more languages and cultures. Initially, force of arms helped subdue native populations, but over the course of many decades and centuries, the suppression and allegiance of populations had to be secured by far more effective means than murder and pillage (which provoke counterproductive instability and resistance).

Western education—schooling on the model developed in Europe and (later) the United States—constituted those more effective means. The schools that colonial powers established for native elites, moreover, were almost always conducted in the language of the occupying nation. England, of course, was the leading colonial empire of the 19th century, and that is how English became the language of global commerce.

At the start of the 19th century, Charles Grant (quoted in Spring, 1998, p. 15) insisted on the importance of using English as the language of instruction in India: "To introduce the language of the conquerors, seems to be an obvious means of assimilating a conquered people to them." This policy is the same as that followed in boarding schools for American Indians through the 1950s, where use of native languages was severely and consistently *punished*.

Later in the 19th century, Thomas Macaulay (subsequently British Prime Minister) noted the special role for education in helping to administer a vast empire:

> We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect. (quoted in Spring, 1998, p. 16)

It is good to remember the obvious in this case: Only already powerful countries colonize and the interests of native people predictably play almost no part in the reasoning of conquistadores or empire builders from the West. Schooling, in this light, is a technology to produce workers who can help the empire builders achieve their objectives.

Lest readers think that a Western education would not be so bad for Africans, Asians, or American Indians, remember that the select few to receive Western-style schooling were to form the elite administrators whose tastes, opinions, morals, and intellect would make them sympathetic to the aims of the empire builders. At base, the issues were economic, not

educational, and the education and the economies together served not native interests, but those of the colonizers:

> The land at present available in our colony is suitable for European settlement. We cannot carry out this settlement, however, without additional labor. This must be provided by the natives and we shall train them for it... We shall make people realize that we Germans [English, Belgians, French, Americans] are masters of the country and the natives are servants. (Carl Sclettwein, 1905, quoted in Cohen, 1994, p. 93)

Such educational purposes and the regimes to realize them were common throughout Asia and Africa until the official dissolution of European colonial empires that set in after 1945 (the end of the Second World War).

The largest empire, of course, left the legacy of English as the birthright of local ruling elites. In Singapore, in India, and in large parts of Africa, schools, and especially universities, still employ English as the language of instruction. As Grant and Macaulay predicted, however, language use also entails commitments and dispositions that link minds together with the prerogatives of the former colonial regimes. Education, in short, is the institution that allowed colonial, and later imperial, regimes to function profitably for the long term. It has also enabled and facilitated globalization.

Globalization as Power

Globalization is the kind of imposition that can occur only as the result of *immense* economic, cultural, political, and military power. This power extends the achievements of colonialism (colonies as sources of exotic products) and imperialism (colonies as markets for manufactured goods) more insistently and with greater coordination than ever before. Like its predecessors, globalization uses educational institutions to give it legitimacy and long-term

viability. Making international comparisons of educational systems is one way to foster the spirit of competitiveness among educators—particularly school leaders.

TIMSS, the Third International Mathematics and Science Study, is a much-publicized recent international comparison.[3] The finding that the performance of U.S. 12th-graders "was among the lowest of the participating countries in mathematics and science, including among our most advanced students" (National Center for Education Statistics, 2001, ¶ 1) has produced cries of alarm and new instructional initiatives justified with assertions about the requirements of global economic competition.

Sometimes the insistence on competition turns ridiculous. For instance, the description of a session at a recent American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) meeting on "educating scientists, engineers, and technicians for the 21st century" included the peculiar statement[4] that

> The very existence of open markets means that we are all in competition ... [with] foreign workers who may have a better education or demand lower wages or both. The real choice is not whether to compete globally, but how to do it. (cited in Howley, Harmon, & Carter, 1998, p. 5)

Such quotes convey the impression that everyone accepts the advent, prerogatives, and social and cultural effects of globalization, and that they are willing to act contrary to their own logical interests (like "*demanding* lower wages") in order to help transnational corporations compete with one another. In fact, this curious assertion points to an inability to see life from

---

[3]The official TIMSS homepage (http://timss.bc.edu/) is maintained at Boston College.

[4]The strangest part of this assertion is the image of "workers demanding lower wages," and we're sure that, as a new administrator, you'd be surprised to see your teachers rallying for lower wages.

any vantage except that of transnational corporations.

This uncritical mind set, widely propagated, helps disguise the real problems associated with globalization. Although world leaders speak hopefully of a "rising tide that floats all boats," the world economy is becoming increasingly *more unequal*. Major U.S. cities like New York and Chicago share the control of planetary wealth with global cities in Japan, Germany, England, and a handful of other developed nations. This concentration of wealth and power, however, is associated with a decline in even the meager share of global wealth falling to the poorest 20 percent of nations, down from 2.3 percent in 1961 to just 1.4 percent in 1991 (Bauman, 1998, p. 71). Here at home, in the U.S., the top 20 percent of households control 80 percent of the nation's wealth (Mander, 1996) and 50 percent of the nation's income. Even land ownership has become more concentrated than ever in the U.S. Gray (1996) reports, for instance, that land ownership in the U.S. is more concentrated than it was in Cuba in 1959, when the issue of land concentration incited Cuban peasants to help overthrow the government. Tony Clarke of The International Forum on Globalization observes,

> The real power to rule is being exercised not by governments and their agencies, but by transnational corporations (TNCs)....Today, 50 of the top 100 economies in the world are [those of] TNCs, 70 percent of global trade is controlled by just 500 corporations, and a mere 1 percent of the TNCs on this planet own half the total stock of foreign direct investment.....Transnational corporations have effectively secured a system of rule and domination in the new world order. (Clarke, 2000, "Introduction," ¶ 2)

Reform Movements Seen in Global Contexts

"School reform" is a short phrase with a much longer history than new administrators, just emerging from the role of classroom teacher, are likely to realize. The contemporary mass education system itself is a result of reform efforts that began well before the beginning of the

20th century. The magnitude of the accumulated changes are reflected in the 90% decrease in the number of school districts from 1900 to 2000. In 1905, for another example, the National Association of Manufacturers pressed for the massive reform of American schools on the basis of the German threat to American competitiveness (Cuban, 1961). In the era of globalization, however, new reforms line up with the interests of transnational corporations.

Let's look briefly, next, at four major U.S. school reform efforts, in light of some of the issues surrounding globalization:

New American Schools (G. H. Bush administration)

Goals 2000 (G. H. Bush-Clinton administrations)

Systemic Reform Initiatives (National Science Foundation)

and the "E-rate" Program (Congress and the Federal Communications Commission).

The authors have been involved in *each* of these programs, and our point here is not to condemn the programs wholesale, but to demonstrate to new administrators that national programs come with strings already attached to the agenda of globalization.

New American Schools. Debuting in 1991, the New American Schools (NAS) program was openly initiated as a business-led effort, aimed at developing "break the mold" schools that would "jump-start" educational reform. With ample corporate funding as the lure, hundreds of "design teams" across the nation competed for the chance to pilot school prototypes.

The program continues to this day, having institutionalized the work of 10 teams (as of this writing) in what it calls its "portfolio." From the beginning, David Kearns, former CEO of the Xerox corporation, has lead the effort, within government and outside it. The models NAS promotes have much to recommend them, and the NAS "portfolio" does include at least one

reform model developed by a major critic of global capitalism (Henry Levin's Accelerated School Model; see Levin's work with Martin Carnoy, especially their 1985 *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State*).

The NAS connections to globalization are nonetheless strong and implicit. Recently, Arthur F. Ryan joined the board. Ryan is current CEO of Prudential and former CEO of Chase Manhattan Bank, where he had previously been in charge of Chase's worldwide retail banking efforts. Names of NAS board members seem to indicate that no women serve on the board, though web links do not provide anything about the background of board members. NAS supports privatization, not just rhetorically but with private capital at favorable rates: It also runs the Education Entrepreneurs Fund, which it uses to provide below-market loans "to non-profit and for-profit providers of comprehensive school reform models." NAS is simply one effort among many that insinuate the interests of transnational corporations into the classroom life of schools.

Goals 2000. (Bush-Clinton administrations) The Educate America Act ("Goals 2000"), according to a publication of the U.S. Department of Education (1996),

> can help *start your reform efforts* or revitalize existing efforts...You'll be able to see how the learning standards in your school, community, and state measure up to *world-class voluntary national standards*...Your community will be able to draw on voluntary national skill standards—what *workers need to know* and be able to do to enter and succeed in key occupations. These skill standards...can guide the creation of school-to-work programs, which help students learn academic and technical skills needed to *get good jobs* [emphasis added]. ("Goals 2000 Update," ¶ 1)

Goals 2000 was a direct outcome of *Nation at Risk*, which placed blame for the then-faltering U.S. economy on a supposedly inadequate educational system. The problem, according to *Nation at Risk,* was a lack of standards. The first national effort to deploy such standards came in 1990, with the adoption of six national goals for education, in which effort Bill Clinton played a prominent role prior to his election as President.

Goals 2000 was an effort to impose ("disseminate") the national goals (translated in greater detail to curriculum frameworks, standards, and high-stakes testing) to states, local districts, and schools. As with the NAS, the incentive to participate was lots of money. Publicity materials about the Goals 2000 and the national goals mention the participation of "business" leaders at every turn. Not surprisingly, the participation of "labor leaders" or "community activists" is not mentioned, nor in all probability, was it ever seriously solicited.

As in the quoted passage, the purpose of education in Goals 2000 is construed as technical and vocational, and the context most valued for their application is the global context. Professor of legal studies Stephen Arons (1997) argues that Goals 2000 violates the U.S. Constitution by creating "official knowledge" (via national and state standards). Arons argues that the U.S. constitution, and related case law, protects citizens from attempts by the government to establish anything like "official knowledge." Arons insists that

> under Goals 2000, the quality of public schooling and of public discourse about schooling are more likely to decline than to improve....In a nation deeply ambivalent about its own pluralism, intellectual and cultural diversity are likely to be treated more as liabilities than as assets. (Arons, 1997, p. 77)

Adopted during a Democratic administration, but in step with a very conservative agenda, Goals 2000 nonetheless evoked the opposition of many grassroots conservative groups—precisely

because of their objections to "official knowledge."

Systemic Reform Initiatives. (National Science Foundation) These initiatives take systemic reform as a given, "a necessary strategy to provide sustainable improvements in the nation's educational enterprise" (NSF, 2001, ¶ 3). As with Goals 2000, NSF's version of systemic reform sees the alignment of goals, standards, and assessments as critical (the "official knowledge" described by Stephen Arons). With NSF, however, systemic reform of *mathematics and science* education under its sponsorship requires that grantees (states, cities, and rural consortia) flow all available resources from various sources into plans consistent with NSF's requirements. This "coordination" or "leveraging" is not too difficult given the nature of official knowledge, of course, but the key point is the overriding priority of a style of education suited to the requirements of globalization.

The Foundation, befitting a scientific endeavor, stays somewhat at arms length from the arrangements its grantees make. The Alaska Rural Systemic Initiative, for instance, has won praise for its distinctive localizing efforts, including the development of standards for Alaska that reflect the commitments and indigenous knowledge of Alaska Natives. More typical, however, is South Carolina's approach, which proudly asserts its connections with business partners, including global giant Philips electronics, based in the Netherlands, where it is known as "Royal Philips Electronics." Philips is one of the largest electronics firms on the planet, with employees in 60 nations, and sporting sales of nearly 40 billion Euros (Royal Philips Electronics, 2001). The South Carolina program "is the result of an educational reform plan organized by educators at all levels in close collaboration with business and industry and establishes objectives and resources to transform how we teach math and science." (South Carolina State Systemic

Initiative, 2001, ¶ 1).

"E-rate" Program. (Congress and the Federal Communications Commission) The federal e-rate program must surely be one of the most popular federal funding efforts, ever, in support of schools. The program is part of the Universal Service Fund first established to support phone service for low-income families. In 1996 the U.S. telecommunications laws received their first major overhaul since 1934, and, with the Internet becoming a hot new technology at that time, the Clinton administration strongly supported discounts to help wire schools and classrooms to the Net. What could one possibly find to criticize in this worthy program?

Very little, of course. Grousing about the web would be about as short-sighted as grousing (circa 1530) about the advent of printed books. It's hear to stay.

At the same time, of course, it's illuminating to recall what has become of the Internet since 1992 or 1993. At that time, commerce was little in view on the Internet. The Net was largely the province of universities, and democratic non-commercialism was the style of information delivery (among the comparative few with access). A decade later, however, and it's difficult to avoid aggressive web-based advertising for everything from car loans to erotica. E-commerce and free information mix on the web, but today advertising predominates even on "free" sites.

Access to the web gives the erroneous impression that the good "resources" needed to support decent education and schooling come from, well, the Web, which is globally located[5]

---

[5]Excellent teachers are arguably the best "resource" any school can access—a resource that is almost by definition *locally* located. As more virtual schools come online (perhaps serving growing numbers of home-schooled children), however, the "place" of teachers may change.

outside local communities (Howley & Howley, 1995). Use of the web, and the habit of thinking about it in this way (as a resource developed and managed outside any accessible locality) prepare students, gently and seductively, to undertake their future roles as global economic warriors. Indeed, as Spring (1998) notes, this is one reason why major trading nations around the globe are so actively pursuing Internet connectivity for their schools.

The e-rate program is expensive, and some telecommunications companies have argued for its elimination. The focus of the program, like the original Universal Service Fund, is on low-income and poorly-served rural areas, and this fact helps explain corporate misgivings about the program. According to Bauman (1998), impoverished students won't grow up to be either adequate consumers or the sorts of loyal workers who "demand lower wages."

Comparative Modes of Educational Governance

It's important that prospective administrators understand the interplay of centralization and decentralization in the era of globalization. Ironically, both can be used simultaneously to narrow the public purposes of formal schooling to conform better to the requirements of globalization (that is, the needs of transnational corporations and the emerging global institutions, such as the WTO, that legitimize their operations).

Certainly, the ongoing privatization of schooling in the U.S., supported by such organizations as the New American Schools, constitutes a form of decentralization (breaking up the "monopoly" of public schooling). This form of decentralization—privatization—contracts the "public space" that exists in society. At the same time that such decentralizing efforts are underway, efforts like Goals 2000 and the various national standards-based efforts are

centralizing the content of schooling, in line (as we saw in official statements, above) with the globalization agenda. The fact that both tendencies can coexist at the same time hinges on the changing role of the citizen and the nation state, to be considered shortly.

Centralizing Within Decentralization

If educational reform is a matter of *national* security, clearly greater centralization of schooling would seem advisable: Reform that is responsive to the prerogatives of 21st century national security cannot be responsibly organized at the level of grassroots variability, as a kind of educational militia movement. Already, with its fifty plus systems of schooling, the U.S. is at some disadvantage compared to nations like Japan, France, Korea, and Singapore, and even nations like Egypt, where national ministries establish and regulate the single system of schooling that prevails in those countries.

American schools, however, were definitely once local institutions, with vigorous involvement by local people in their establishment and operation. In the ideal, which varied predictably from reality, schools were subsidiary to the local community, much as they still are among the Amish, who aim to practice an agrarian way of life that is attuned to divine purposes, as they interpret them.

As industry came to dominate the U.S. economy, agrarian localism gave way to an industrial plan for schooling. This reform did not just *separate* schools from communities, it physically removed them. In rural areas as in city wards, schools and districts grew in size, merging into larger—often *much larger*—professionally managed administrative units. This process of removing schools from communities is still going on according to the National Trust

for Historic Preservation which recently published a booklet about "school sprawl" (Beaumont & Pianca, 2000). School sprawl is the intentional placement of new school facilities (often multi-school "campuses") not only outside any of the communities whose kids they enroll, but also beyond the reach of foot travel of any sort (Beaumont & Pianca, 2000). In the Trust's view, school sprawl contributes to the decline of the ideal and practice of community in America.

School consolidation and school sprawl are features of *centralization*, but compared to most nations of the world, the United States seems strange, because it actually operates 50+ *systems* of schooling (states plus territories), each with its own peculiarities and commitments. Teachers in the U.S. are not certified nor are they assigned nationally, as is the case, for instance, in Australia and many other nations.

And yet, remarkable features of centralization characterize the U.S. school system. The powers of individual state education agencies are at an all-time high. And state systems are probably more alike than ever. High-stakes testing and accountability have, for instance, been deployed in nearly all the states as of this writing, with similar (though hardly identical) provisions and intentions. Moreover, national reform efforts, such as the New American Schools, Goals 2000, the NSF systemic reform initiatives, and the e-rate program, quickly reach virtually every district in the nation in some fashion.

"Centralization within decentralization" describes the structural tenor of the U.S. system of schooling. Initially constructed to be an industrial form reflective of the interests of big national businesses circa 1900 to 1970, the national systems (federal and state) are now being *reconstructed* in a post-industrial mode befitting the emerging prerogatives of globally-based big business (Spring, 1998). It's easy to see that centralization and decentralization are every bit as

compatible as are globalization and localization in Zygmunt Bauman's account.

Decentralizing From Within Centralization

Since flexibility and innovation are the requirements of the new corporate regimes, a new kind of decentralization ("privatization") is touted by the contemporary business interests (see, e.g., Chubb & Moe, 1990). The argument is made, on convincing terms, that *bureaucratic* styles of professional school governance (a major achievement of earlier reforms) now stymie or altogether suppress the flexibility and innovation that should characterize effective education in the present century. Indeed, the argument in favor of this sort of decentralization suggests that the competition that makes businesses excellent will naturally make schools more widely excellent. The disenchantment of the public with its schools (Mathews, 1996), moreover, gives these proposals natural supporters.

What we see in this scenario is the operation of inherent contradictions in the success of the earlier reform initiatives. First, business creates a model of schooling in its own image, and increasingly renders schooling irrelevant to the fate and character of local places. Professional administration and the creation of larger and larger administrative units (that is, schools and districts), actively pushes the public out of its intimate and messy connections with local schooling. Schooling becomes more a state and national prerogative than a local one, bureaucratically organized after the factory-age business model.

Second, the foundation of business activity changes dramatically in the "information age." Just as industry displaced agriculture as the center of economic growth, so information (digital computing) has displaced industrial manufacturing.

Third, the new post-industrial business regimes clamor for schools that respond better to the requirements of the post-industrial, digital-era economy. Privatization is the proposed solution, and the success of the earlier reforms in alienating the public from its schools enables the ultimate success of various forms of privatization. Schooling is brought more firmly into the marketplace.

Today, the views of most Americans, particularly school administrators in many states, are so different from the views held by Americans in 1880, that we can hardly even imagine schools that are subsidiary to communities (but see Tiller, 2000). At the same time, many people—especially well educated people—understand schooling to so broaden students' outlooks that adult life in their local communities inevitably seems inadequate and mean. From this perspective, only "losers" stay close to home. (This is *not* what the authors think!)

We're not arguing against high aspirations, but instead suggesting that a variety of high aspirations exists, only some of which can even be acknowledged as relevant to schooling if communities are understood as *irrelevant* to schooling. For instance, becoming a nuclear physicist and working at Los Alamos is one sort of high aspiration, but so is staying close to home and becoming an excellent teacher, contractor, technician, small business owner, or farmer.

If more principals and superintendents could put the issue in those terms, more public schools might act as if the emerging global arrangement is not just an inevitable natural order, but a changeable one that is *being created by people*. Public schools might serve more local purposes than they do now: Privatization is hardly the only mode of decentralization; certainly we can imagine a mode of decentralization that attends to public purposes (see, e.g., chapter 8).

Dominant Educational Practices in Dominated Places

Part of the political change in this era of change most ominously concerns citizenship, which was once grounded in the local governance of local places within nation states. In the agrarian age, *citizenship* in nation-states was in fact the ultimate justification for the legitimacy of the nation. The United States (1776) and the French Republic (1789) were founded on this principle. Citizens had natural rights, which empowered them, individually and jointly, to form or dissolve nations and to found or overturn governments. *Citizens (actual people) were to run the political organization of nations.* This was once the meaning of "democracy."

How could this startling aim be realized in a world, circa 1776, thoroughly dominated by the power of a divinely ordained nobility? The answer was that *education* needed to prepare ordinary people for the role of citizen. To sponsor such an education, *mass schooling* had to be invented, a form of schooling that had to reach more and more children as the franchise[6] became more and more inclusive.

In reality, then, *education actually constituted the nation state*, both in terms of its legitimacy (it made the citizens whose existence justified the nation) and in terms of the nation's political actors (it made the citizens who secured the fate of the nation). This is how education, the nation, and the citizen were conceived *in an agrarian age*, and this is really the image most people retain when they consider the role of schooling in a democracy. Today, citizens need to wonder how apt this image is to a post-industrial emerging global order. The U.S. Constitution, of course, is completely silent about the role of corporations in politics, since they barely existed

---

[6] The right to vote defined who would be considered an active citizen—and this right was slowly widened in the U.S. from just white male property owners to all adults beginning at age 18 (with legal rights not always ensuring access to the polling booth).

in 1789.

The industrial era changed many of the purposes of education (i.e., education became a *system* of scientifically managed career selection and preparation) but left the sentiment about citizenship in place. Thus, in the 1950s and 1960s, "citizenship" (or "civics") became institutionalized as a specialized social studies course that considered principally the mechanisms of government, but not the very difficult and troubling issues of corporate power. The emphasis was on creating "good" citizens, individuals who exercised the right to vote but remained aloof from heated political contest, unless they became professional politicians (see, e.g., Spring, 1998; Zinn, 1999). The real political power, however, increasingly devolved to large corporations. Corporations had a great deal at stake and the funds to protect and advance their interests through the political process (often via trade associations), whereas mere citizens lacked comparable resources to articulate or advance public interests in the political sphere. According to some observers (e.g., Spring, 1998), schooling had also failed many individuals, denying them the intellectual tools needed for effective citizenship. From the perspective of colonization, this denial can be understood as *intentional* rather than accidental.

The post-industrial era (the era of globalization) is bringing additional changes. Saskia Sassen, a leading scholar of globalization, believes that *multi-national firms are the true citizens of "the new world order."* Further, she suspects that globalization may not be the undoubted good that international political leaders (and educational leaders in the various states and nations) believe it to be. She asks,

> Do we want the global capital market to exercise this discipline over our governments: and to do so at all costs—jobs, wages, safety, health—and without a public debate? While it is true that these markets are the result of multiple decisions by multiple

> investors and thus have a certain democratic aura, all the "voters" have to own capital, and small investors typically operate through institutional investors, such as pension funds, banks, and hedge funds. *This leaves the vast majority of a country's citizens without any say* [emphasis added]. (1996, p. 51)

Putting the situation most dramatically, we might frame the following hypothesis: *If the historical role of the individual citizen is in decline, so is the role of mass education.* The reasoning goes like this: (1) If the public purpose of education no longer really exists (because the individual citizen has been supplanted by the corporate "citizen"), then (2) public schools are not really needed any longer, or they are needed for much more limited purposes.

Privately operated schools might provide what is supposedly needed more efficiently and effectively. It's no wonder that growing doubt now exists about the sustainability of public schooling even in the U.S., once viewed as the world's heartland of democracy. Clearly, we think the hypothesis has chilling merit. And we suspect that the demise of the role of citizen would trouble many educators, if they knew about it.

Locating the U.S. in the Larger World

The United States has a special role in globalization, a role to which we have paid scant attention so far. The role is this: The United States is the dominant player.

When politicians talk about securing a grand destiny for the U.S. in this century, they are not speaking as representatives of a country of under-dogs seeking finally to make good in the world. They are talking about a national economy that consumes a terribly disproportionate share of the world's resources, and one that enjoys a standard of living so high that the poor of the U.S. "enjoy" resources that make them seem rich by the standards that prevail throughout the

developing world.

The language of competitiveness, in the context of this degree of wealth and worldwide influence, is the language of thoughtless greed, according to many observers, and this outlook on the world informs the values of contemporary American schooling (see, e.g., Howley et al., 1995; Orr, 1995; Purpel, 1999; Spring, 1998). What makes it so easy for Americans, who are in reality a generous people, to accept a system of schooling reformed so explicitly in the service of greed?

There are several answers. The first is the interaction of capitalist and protestant worldviews (Spring, 1998; Weber, 1904/1958). In some denominations particularly, wealth is a sign of God's grace. The logic for this position is this: (1) If such qualities as individual industry, thrift, and responsibility are among Christian *virtues*, then, (2) their reward (as virtues) in the form of wealth might well be anticipated, especially (3) under a capitalist economic system. The absence of such virtues might also be expected to produce poverty. Thus, from one vantage on Christianity, economic well-being and poverty proceed directly from right living.

Other interpretations of Christianity, of course, don't emphasize so rigid a view of sin and virtue, but stress forgiveness, charity, and the holiness of the poor. In the New Testament, Christ Himself harbors contempt for the rich and compassion for the poor. "The meek shall inherit the earth," He said. He was probably thinking of the poor and those who take their side, in this interpretation. So the interaction of Christianity and capitalist ideology is hardly a full answer to our question.

Another answer is patriotism. Many Americans believe that the United States is the best nation on earth. Some people might think this is the result of its citizens' high level of aggregate virtue, though international statistics on crime might be understood as providing contradictory

evidence. If this is the case in reality, for whatever reason, then a reasonable conclusion might be that the American Way should become the way of the whole world. Struggling nations, on this view, need to learn our ways, and doing business with them is perhaps one of the best means of helping them learn.

There are other views of patriotism, however. These other views stress the values of liberty, equality, and the common good. This is a less prideful view of patriotism, and it would permit other nations to forge different paths (liberty on an international and national scale); it would not understand the varying cultures within them as naive, but, rather as having unique integrity (equality on a national or regional scale); and it would understand that construction of the common good here at home, as well as in other nations, was very much an incomplete task. Spring (1998), among others, blames the U.S. history curriculum for reinforcing a thoughtless kind of "U.S. Number One" patriotism.[7]

Ironically, another answer is a failure of Americans to *think* globally. We have tended to let politicians and the CEOs of transnational corporations do our thinking about globalization for us—which circumstance, as noted before, is the motive for this chapter. If Americans thought more about the historical role of the U.S. in the affairs of other nations, if they understood (rather than forgot) the catastrophe of the southeast Asian wars of the 1950s-1980s, much of which misery was paid for and executed by the U.S., they might find the heavy corporate influence on educational aims and curricula much more troublesome.

---

[7]If formal education is understood as necessarily creating the nation, of course, the temptation to supply a patriotic history and civics curriculum is strong; it's a temptation that a nation prizing critical thought in its citizens would resist, however. The fact that such matters are debated at all in the U.S. (see, e.g., Spring, 1998) is one among many hopeful signs.

Diversity—Internal and External

David Korten (1996) characterizes globalization as an extremist ideology. He argues that the ideology of the global free market has displaced the traditional pluralism that has, in his estimation, sustained the U.S. for generations.

The extremist ideology, according to Korten, includes the myth that the success of developed nations in the post-World War II period was due to free-market traditions. Korten claims that, on the contrary, the success stemmed from "rejection of ideological extremism in favor of a system of governance based on a pragmatic, nonideological, institutional balance among the forces of government, market, and civil society" (p. 184).

In other words, in Korten's view, the strength of the United States lay in the respect its institutions accorded diversity: the *necessity* of competing views (e.g., many of those articulated in this book), the *productivity* of well-informed debate, the *experimentation* with radically different social and political arrangements, and the *cross-fertilization* arising from the clash of different cultures. In Korten's view, America needs both socialists and capitalists; those who believe in schooling mostly for jobs and those who believe in schooling mostly for the life of the mind; the pious and the free-thinkers; sinners and saints. America, in this view, needs people of all races, cultures, and creeds. From this perspective, the more alike we become, the weaker become our economics, politics, cultures, and ethics. Korten's view is really a traditional American view, generous towards newcomers, and grounded in toleration and democratic hopefulness. For this reason, his accusation of "extremism" is quite compelling. Korten prescribes internal diversity for American society.

In *Short Route to Chaos* Stephen Arons (1997) gives much the same prescription for schooling in the U.S. According to Arons, American schools, shaped by such programs as Goals 2000, and also by professional educational bureaucracies, suffer because they are so dramatically out of step with the actual and traditional diversity of American society. Arons, like famed New York City educator Deborah Meier, supports public school choice: schools operated in the public interest, but on commitments and methods that vary substantially from school to school. Arons and Meier believe that a vigorous democracy is served best by this traditional diversity. On these terms, the standards movement and the version of "systemic reform" based on standards and accountability is fatally wrong. If it succeeds, according to these authors, it will further injure an already imperiled democracy in the U.S. (see also, Strike, 1997).

A similar argument pertains to diversity throughout the world. Commentators like Bauman (1998) and Spring (1998) are troubled by globalization for reasons that accord with Korten's observations about pluralism. Both authors portray the operation of globalization as suppressing or eliminating cultural, economic, and political practices among the various nations. The invading forces in this neo-colonialism, however, build mass cultures with Western cultural products, values, and expectations. Vastly superior economic power ensures a degree of success nearly everywhere on earth. This cultural colonization remakes once diverse cultures into institutional consumers (with entire cultures playing the role of consumer, much as transnational corporations play the role of citizen). These new consumers not only accept cultural products and services from the developed world, but also the cultural practices and *values* of the developed world. Such transformations can be very rapid in the era of globalization.

If this analysis sounds too abstract or remote to merit consideration by school

administrators, consider that this sort of cultural colonialism also operates within the *developed* world, and within subcultures of single nations in the developed world (including the U.S.). An analogy may help you to see the specific applicability to schooling.

Consider the choice of Melissa Freeport, a principal concerned with improving mathematics learning in an inner-city school that enrolls a large minority population. Melissa is a former math teacher—a really good one. She knows that math is about ideas and patterns and relationships among numbers rather than just about getting right answers and remembering the "correct" steps to solve routine problems. She also knows that most of the kids in her elementary school are likely not to complete high school. Melissa has been advised by the curriculum people of her large district to adopt one of the NSF-funded curriculum systems. She understands the materials are well-designed and represent a lot of what she believes to be true (i.e., they approach instruction from a "constructivist" stance). At the same time, she knows that her faculty is not by any means ready to accept the program; there is horrendous staff turnover at this school and expectations are consistently low. Melissa thinks that a direct-instruction approach will probably serve students better at this time. She's afraid to voice her concern because, well, it's an insult to the expertise of the district's curriculum experts. She doesn't want to be seen as a heretic or a loser.

Melissa's dilemma is a common one, and it has a something in common with cultural colonization. Very influential forces are trying to shape her professional choices and judgment; but, like most of us, Melissa retains her doubts and her capacity to think for herself. In the end though, again like most of us, she'll probably capitulate and adopt the constructivist program. New administrators and teachers preparing to become administrators are not likely to realize that

30 years ago *behaviorism* (now all but discredited as an approach to teaching and learning) was the dominant ideology of instruction. Direct instruction relies on the insights of behaviorism, which, though widely discredited at present, retain their relevance to some settings, possibly including Melissa's.

Few analogies are a perfect match, and this one isn't either. It can, however, on occasion, be helpful to examine the dissemination of educational innovations as a possible instance of cultural colonization (see, e.g., Hertert, 1996). Remember Korten's point about diversity: it's summed up by the folk wisdom, "It takes all kinds."

Even on the terms of neo-liberal economics, the functioning of the global economy would seem to benefit—via the strong participation of Eastern nations like China, Japan, Korea, and Singapore—from diversity. The Eastern approach, which stresses loyalty to the collectivity over individualism (whether the State is capitalist, like Japan, or free-market socialist, like Singapore, or communist, like China), remains the chief threat (via economic and political competition) to Western dominion over the globe. If competition is good for the system, it would seem logical to conclude that very different national characters would strengthen, not subvert, the global economy.

Arguably, the same degree of pluralism that sustains the U.S. democracy is needed globally. If a single economic regime—the neo-liberal economics of advanced capitalism—dominates the world, it will work (is already working) to reduce cultural, political, and economic diversity worldwide. These losses are intellectual, cultural, and spiritual, and they could prove to be immensely harmful or ultimately fatal to the well-being of the planet (Orr, 1995). The end result of such disappearances will be loss of the very traditions that were once

thought to constitute a true and powerful education (see, e.g., Howley et al., 1995).

"International" Children in American Schools

In the 19th century, immigrants to the U.S. were expected to "Americanize." It's difficult, however, for us to imagine today what our nation was like in, say 1850 or 1890. Who were the Americans, at that time?

America in the 19th century was rural and agrarian. Thus, part of what made the U.S. appealing was the prospect of obtaining land to work. People who have not raised crops and animals (most of us today) cannot imagine the power of this attraction!

After 1890, however, the agrarian ideal would, together with the prominence of agricultural livelihoods, declined precipitously. Industrialization in the 20th century meant the growth of big business and the rise of corporations—some of them predecessors to the transnational corporations of the current era. Corporations dwarfed individuals as political actors, especially in the last half of the 20th century. These two changes—closing the frontier and the occupation of all land, and the rise of corporations as political actors—also meant the virtual end of the democratic project as it had been known from 1776 through about 1940, according to some writers (Kemmis, 1990; Theobald, 1997).

Immigrants arriving in the U.S. after the middle of the twentieth century confronted a different America and a different project of "Americanization" as compared to previous waves of immigrants. Few new immigrants seek to become farmers today because, of course, farming in America is such a bad investment for hard-earned cash (Strange, 1988).

What does it mean for contemporary immigrant students to "Americanize"? The answer

seems apparent: To be a functional American requires conformity an economic image of success. Commitments to democratic values ends with voting; the work of nation-building has been concluded (Kemmis, 1990), and new in migrants therefore are seen as having less to contribute to the sustainability of democracy or the constitution of the nation. Indeed, some groups seek to close U.S. borders to poor immigrants altogether. The cultures of new immigrants may be seen by many Americans as irrelevancies, nuisances, and threats to national well-being. On Korten's logic, a decline in pluralism is apt to entail a decline in tolerance.

New immigrants are not the only kind of international children in U.S. schools, however. Nor are they the only ones likely to suffer from a decline in tolerance. "International" people who have lived in the U.S. for many generations—if their skin color is not white—can be seen as more alien than newcomers, especially if they are poor.

Mexican American citizens of the U.S. have been deported in the past simply because they *looked* Mexican. Impoverished African Americans are regarded by many whites as somehow un-American, and sentiments among racists for "repatriation" to Africa persist to this day. American Indians, the very people first indicated by the word "American," and whose uniqueness somehow captured the uniqueness of the American democratic experiment in the minds of the founders (Zinn, 1999), remain curiously un-American after hundreds of years of domination by invading cultures. American Indians, of course, experience great poverty and have among the lowest rates of educational attainment in the nation. And yet, American Indians are U.S. citizens as well as citizens of their own Indian nations. Few Americans understand such complexities.

Curiously, the proportion of "international children" in U.S. schools is increasing as a

share of the total student population. Unless these children, who often live in marginal circumstances, can be converted into productive workers and eager consumers—the job multinational business interests assign to schools under the new world order—they will grow up to have children who will also experience difficulty "Americanizing" (see Michie, 1999). Hypothetically, people in such circumstances could one day outnumber those who believe they represent the "true" America.

This perspective nonetheless accords with Zygmunt Bauman's analyses, in which an increasingly powerful small elite restricts the movement and opportunities of everyone else. If Bauman is right, the poor and the children of the poor (including disproportionate representation of "international children") will inhabit a dreary localized domain. Another alternative is that the growing disparity between "the haves" and "the have-nots" (with large ethnic and racial divides) will eventually lead to conflict between dispossessed masses localized worldwide and a fabulously wealthy cosmopolitan elite. Though this seems unlikely in 2001, the lessons of history provide warrant for the possibility sometime in the future, given conditions of misery and vastly unequal wealth that prevail in the world today.[8]

Alternatives to Colonialism

This chapter has reported information about the forces of globalization that, taken

---

[8]Because income inequality is associated with increased penetration of transnational corporations (Beer, 1999), there is reason to suspect that worldwide inequality has increased since 1993. In fact, income inequality between nations is staggering and reportedly accounts for most of the income inequality among individual people. Moreover, income inequality among individuals is worsening: the *"bottom" 85%* of the world population received 41% of the world's income in 1988, but just 37.1% in 1993 (Milanovic, 2000). The top 5% increased its share of world income from 31.2% to 33.7% in the same five-year period.

together, can make the success of globalization sound inevitable, with dreadful implications for most humans. That impression is not the one we want to leave with readers at the end of the chapter! The success of globalization is likely to be partial, and its failures, we suspect, will leave room for hope. History is our guide to these reflections. In this section, as the chapter concludes, we provide counsel based on our own interpretations, and not as any sort of expert directive to readers. Other views are necessary and valuable; these are merely ours.

Most readers (with the authors) probably agree that some amount of competitive spirit is energizing and productive. However, when every individual, town, city, state, nation, and corporation vies for an increasing share of global wealth—of the resources of the earth—history suggests that catastrophe will follow. The First World War, 1914-1918, was the result of the first wave of imperialism (globalization without the digital toolkit and the influence of transnational corporations). The Second World War, 1939-1945, was for the most part an extension of the 1914-1918 war. And America's conduct of a monumentally expensive and genocidal war against tiny Vietnam (with a mostly *peasant* population) was also a legacy of the imperialist era and the Cold War.

In a sense, the 20th century stands as a testimonial to the sorts of disasters that follow from unbridled greed and the hubris (false pride) of colonial and imperial ambitions. A 21st century designed to propagate worldwide competition at all levels of scale from the individual to the supra-national corporation would seem, on this basis, a very ill-advised strategy for living well.

Will a catastrophe develop? Will it be precipitated by the successes of globalization or by its failures, or by both? Will it destroy the lives of millions or billions? We cannot know the

answers with much certainty. We can, however, say that the "success" of globalization probably rests on the degree to which it (i.e., "the post-industrial worldwide manifestation of free trade under neo-liberal economic rules") is able to provide reasonable levels of equality *and* prosperity for the world's population, as well as to care for the underlying sustainability of the earth's resources. So far, it is doing a remarkably poor job with both challenges according to many observers (e.g., Beer, 1999; Orr, 1995; Sassen, 1996; Spring, 1998). This is not a surprise to people familiar with the history of colonialism and imperialism.

The tenets of globalization—greed and unlimited growth—do not augur well for success in achieving worldwide social equity or planetary sustainability. The accumulating data tend to confirm this assessment, but there is more to come as the history of globalization continues to unfold rapidly.

In this circumstance, we recommend a conservative approach that positions education within this evolving history. Our view differs dramatically from the official recommendations educators receive from government and business leaders. We advise educators and school administrators to plan for the *failures*—not the catastrophic successes—of globalization.

How can this be done? Most important is to take a long view, just as the long view is most important in planning *any* school improvement effort. *Loudly* opposing globalization in school board rooms and administrative offices in schools and districts probably would not be the best route forward. It would probably be shortsighted and counterproductive, given the context that prompted this chapter (widespread propaganda representing one side of the issue). We have in mind a more positive and educationally relevant approach—cultivating alternatives to the kind of thinking demanded by the extremism of globalist rhetoric.

This is a long-term educational mission, rather than a short-term political one. Not coincidentally, the long view is the one promoted by such school reformers as Theodore Sizer (Coalition of Essential Schools), Mortimer Adler (the Paidaea Proposal); Henry Levin (Accelerated Schools), and the Rural School and Community Trust (Place-Based Pedagogy).

These kinds of reforms, by the way, are still very difficult because they embody complex commitments. These difficult commitments center on democratic purpose, the common good, engagement with community, and development of students' capacity to *critique* their worlds *freely*—not just to subsist as consumers and producers and parrot thoughtless propaganda.

Such efforts do not sidestep issues of intellectual rigor and academic verve, but embrace high and locally responsive standards. They support curricula that position engaged citizenship as the most important instructional outcome for students. History instruction, on this view, would promote critical intent rather than reinforcing thoughtless patriotism. Science would be practiced *not mostly* as a preparation for the more advanced science study of a small elite, but *mostly as a here-and-now issue of importance to ordinary people locally situated* (e.g., Wolff-Michael, 2001). Mathematics instruction would aim as much to help students appreciate its beauty as its practicality, but, like science, it would be attached to local practices and purposes. In short, the long-term view raises the ante for scholarship and intellect and mutes the role of schooling as a form of indoctrination for life under the administration of transnational corporations. It offers students and communities the intellectual and moral means to resist the liabilities of both localization and globalization.

In the hoopla surrounding accountability and standards-based reform, some readers will probably find this claim (about the role of scholarship and intellect in the "long-term view")

difficult to believe, understand, or practice. It's likely to be regarded as impractical. We know that.

Consider however, the purposes of education under globalization: to prepare children for future roles as consumers and producers. To become functional workers and consumers under the regime of globalization, individuals need to learn *not* to think certain things. They need *not* to question too closely the tenets of globalization; they need *not* to question the role of the United States in the world, or the history of government action toward the poor and ethnic minorities (see, e.g., Zinn, 1999); they need *not* to imagine a kind of science independent of corporate funding; and they *especially need not* to understand why personal restraint in accumulating wealth might be ethically, aesthetically, and environmentally proper. Perhaps most of all, they need *not* to regard many of the major issues of life as *unsettled*: People who question the authority of transnational corporations and the new global order sponsored by transnational corporations will be dangerous to that order, at some point in the future. The kind of critical thinking demanded by "employers" is thus *very different* from the kind that develops the intellect. In our view, self-respecting educators won't want to lead such a curriculum, which is essentially *a curriculum of thoughtlessness*.

Summary

We addressed globalization in this chapter for several reasons—partly because it's the economic basis of "the information age" (the ponderous big reason) and partly because school administrators are continually bombarded by thoughtless directives to lead schools into the globalized 21st century (the annoying little reason). The chapter makes connections between the

big reason and the little one because these connections are momentously significant for school leaders, but little considered in textbooks written for them.

The chapter defines globalization as *the post-industrial worldwide manifestation of free trade under neo-liberal economic rules*. In plain English this means "advanced capitalism taken to scale worldwide scale on the back of the digital revolution." The key concepts related to globalization are localization, colonialism, imperialism, transnational corporations, centralization-decentralization, democracy, the nature of citizenship, and the relationship between diversity and pluralism.

The little reason turns out not just to have annoyed the authors, but to have annoyed an assortment of writers and scholars, who regard use of the word "globalization" with considerable suspicion. Their worst complaint is educational: the word seems to be used too often by internationally prominent politicians and business leaders to short-circuit critical thinking about the implications of an advanced capitalism taken to worldwide scale on the back of the digital revolution. Clearly, people who can't think about the big issues of the day are in trouble, and this is a major problem for education, and, therefore, for educational leaders.

The difficulties thus swept under the carpet, however, are not just those raised by critics of globalization. The instability of global competition, warn prominent capitalists like George Soros, can subvert the interests of transnational corporations and undo the tenuous trading agreements that underwrite globalization and its hopes for success. If not managed well, intense competition can lead to monopolies (which curtail or disable competition) and to the increasing wealth disparities (locally, nationally, and internationally) that are already well in evidence.

The developmental line represented by colonialism, imperialism, and globalization entails

the rise of mass education as an instrument to pacify, or "civilize," the masses of people drawn into industrial employment worldwide beginning in the 19th century. This effort didn't just take place in the industrial nations, but was also used in colonies to establish native administrative elites who could help colonial powers rule then colonies. Later, under imperialism, these elites were able to help the former colonial powers establish strong markets for their industrial goods among their former colonies. Often, the Western language became the language of instruction, and this is how English became the planetary common language of commerce, diplomacy, and emerging transnational culture by the end of the 20th century.

School systems here and elsewhere in the world are used increasingly to bolster the interests and prerogatives of transnational corporations. Sometimes the influence is subtle, and sometimes heavy-handed. In all cases, it's relentless. The chief practical problem with this educational influence is that it remakes students as future global economic warriors, and the history of colonialism and imperialism suggests that such a preparation can lead to catastrophic ends. More fundamentally, the influence of transnational corporations in the world economy seems to be creating new forms of political governance that subvert the long-settled power of nation states. Very few professional educators understand that the fundamental justification for the very existence of nation states is the *citizen,* and that, under democratic forms of government, schools exist to create citizens capable of sustaining democratic nation-states. Without citizens, the need for public schooling would be needed only to the extent necessary to create workers and consumers. Today, private enterprise is making the claim that it can do this faster, cheaper, and better than any public institution; the evidence is thin so far, but the claim will continue to be pressed given the jeopardy in which the public purposes of schooling have been placed. If

schooling gives up on the project of cultivating thoughtful citizens, private enterprise will eventually be proven right.

School leaders urgently need to consider the extent to which school reforms are driven by the agenda of globalization, they need to listen carefully to the rhetoric of globalization in which so many reform efforts are couched, and they need to ask difficult questions about the way local schooling works to prepare students to conduct maximally thoughtful lives. We advise school leaders to plan for the failures of globalization, on the basis of history, but this counsel is based on a conservative view of educational purpose and the prospects for the future. We encourage readers, in the end, to think for themselves.

Culminating Case Study:

First in the World in Carter Schools

Set Up

The principals of the four high schools in Carter School District, a mostly suburban, partly rural, district in the southwest, are about to take part in the superintendent's monthly meeting with high school principals, held today at the Jose Martí high school. (Why a high school in a largely Mexican-American locale might have been named for a Cuban hero is information that has faded from institutional memory; the main part of the school building is 60 years old and it has apparently carried that name during all that time.)

The main item on this month's meeting concerns what to do about math and science scores on the state accountability tests. A special effort to clear the agenda for consideration of this topic has been in the works for months, but one crisis or another has kept the agenda booked. The superintendent, Jim Blakefield, has set the agenda for the meeting, but no one seems to know what he has up his sleeve. All the principals realize he thinks this is important, because it's persisted on the agenda for several meetings in a row.

Jim's been superintendent for three years, following his first superintendency in a smaller and poorer district in a more urban area. He's well liked by some people, but faulted by others for "playing his cards close to his chest." That is, the union people regard him as uncommunicative with a tendency toward authoritarianism. The principals generally have a different view. They think he's a go-getter and a refreshing change from the "caretaker" superintendent of the previous 15 years. At least three of the principals think that. The other one, George Gonzalez finds Blakefield abrasive and clueless about

the local communities, which is perhaps understandable since George grew up around here. George is the only chicano principal; the rest are anglos. George has been a principal for seven years and is popular with the community. All principals are male, and George is the only one with a background in coaching (baseball).

The three anglo principals are Jim's choices to replace departing principals--two retirees and one who took a job in a neighboring district (for more pay). Two were from outside the district. One of the others (Albert Smith) is a second-year experienced principal, and the other one (Frank Bacon) is in his first principalship. The within-district new hire is Andrew Darman, former chair of the math department at Jose Martí. Darman is in his second year as a principal.

The Meeting

Jim opens the meeting with the following words, "We've got, at last, just one item on the agenda for today, but it's a big one, and I'm hoping it's gonna occupy our attention for some time to come. I know you're curious what I've got up my sleeve. A few months back I read a piece in *The American School Board Journal* that just stuck with me. I couldn't let go of it. I've got copies of it for each of you. This is the first I've shared my thoughts with anyone in the district, so bear with me for a while.

"You know this district is doing OK by the conventional standards that the state uses to judge schools. Yeah, yeah, I'm no more impressed by that scheme than most of us, but I gotta say one thing: these dumb tests at least get attention focused on what students should know and be able to do. If student learning is not about that, then I don't know why we bother to have schools at all. Right. We're not in the top category, 'effective school,' but there's no reason to be complacent about our level of performance. We've got an average socioeconomic base in this district, and we've got average test scores in a lot of different subjects. Big deal. That's not competitive--no way. I mean, listen guys, little South Greenville district down the road is doing just about as well as we are, with a few exceptions. I

guess, and they're dirt-poor! OK, they've missed a few points in the accountability system and are one step down from us, but they're closing fast, guys. They could make us look bad in a year or two if we don't light a fire someplace. I'd say, 'good for them,' too if they did.

"All right. Let me talk about that article in the *School Board Journal*. It was written by a superintendent and a couple of others. A bunch of suburban superintendents got together and decided that complacency wasn't good enough for them. Of course, they don't have a lot of the problems we have, and they sure as hell don't have all the problems that big-city districts have. But here's the thing: most of their schools were doing real, real well on the state accountability measures, and they *still* weren't satisfied. So they did something pretty simple, maybe so simple it's stupid, but it's not so much what they did but what it eventually meant to the districts. They decided to take the national goal (you boys remember Goals 2000 don't you?) of being number one in mathematics and science achievement seriously.

"How seriously? So seriously that they decided to use an international math and science test right in their own districts with their own kids and teachers. Compare their kids to kids in Korea and Japan and Singapore and Germany. Sounds real simple, doesn't it?

"It wasn't. Read the article and you'll see; they had to pull a lot of strings just to get baseline data. With all the hoopla about the importance of math and science to the 21st century economy, and all the hoopla about America's lousy performance compared to the competition, you'd think it would be pretty easy to get a fix on this idea. Wrong, wrong, wrong.

"Anyway, I want you guys to read the article and help me think about what we can do around here to give our own complacency a real jolt. There are lots of options, but I may as well tell you what my preference is. I think we ought to generate some enthusiasm for a similar group right here in this little corner of our state. Hell, nobody thinks of New Mexico as a first-in-the-world anything except maybe pottery and poverty--but, at least in my experience, the quaintness of our state pretty much makes

it impossible for outsiders even to see the state's poverty. Anyway, you see where I'm goin' with this--we can maybe motivate people around here, and make something of a splash in the state at the same time. I'm real serious about this because I'm gettin' bored with putting out these little fires; they eat up our time; they aren't really that much of a challenge; and they don't feel very much like real work, not to me at least. We need to do a lot more. End of my spiel ... now it's your turn.

The principals remain impassive for a second, and then Andrew Darman jumps in. "I think the focus on mathematics makes a lot of sense, obviously, but I think this kind of thing might have a wider influence eventually, even in other areas. We need to do more for our academically able kids in the Carter District. They do OK, but we're not even close to pushing them to potential. I'm definitely in favor of raising the bar... but, ya know, it's gonna be tough goin' with some of the folks we got in the classroom. The older folks, and I'm thinkin' mostly about a coupla people—you know exactly who I mean—in my school. Biding time until they can retire."

Heads nod when Andrew makes this reference. Evidently, he's not the only one to think this way. Now that they're principals, perhaps, they're more willing to see (some) teachers as "the problem."

Frank Bacon, the first-year principal is the next to talk. He says, "I'm with you, Jim, and I agree with Andy's take on our advanced kids—they're not as advanced as they could be. Of course, those are my kids in lots of ways, since AP English was my thing. My only two cents is that we oughta consider communication issues and not just math and science. I know what everybody says about the world economy, and, yeah, we've had some plant closings around here, so I know what the concern is."

Jim responds, "Frank, we know what English teachers think." There are chuckles around the room. "But seriously, Frank, if you look into the research base behind this thing, you'll discover that communication and literacy are big parts of it. That's one of the things that got my attention. So, yeah, Andy and Frank, it's bigger than just this subject or that. And there's another thing, too, that I want you guys to think about, and that's the key idea of getting a bunch of districts, well a few anyhow, together

on this thing. I've already talked to Bill Naylor and Dr. Frances [superintendents of neighboring districts] and they're game to play. They've got the same situation as us--doing OK but not real great on the accountability test. They thought it might be worth doing something along these lines."

At this point, George Gonzalez says, "What do you really have in mind, Jim? I mean, I'm aware of what TIMSS [see page 22 in this chapter] says about how we compare with other countries, but, frankly, I don't see the need with all that we've got going in the way of improvement initiatives. We're working on these problems, at least with a variety of efforts to make things better for our low performers. You ask me, they're our best bet for doing better on the state tests. I'm takin' a research class right now, pretty useless if you ask me, but I learned something interesting. Groups of kids taking a test naturally drift toward the average when they're re-tested. That means the hi-fliers would tend to drift downward and the low-performers to drift upward. We give the low-performers some coaching, some incentives, and more attention than they usually get, and their scores will probably go up. With your hi-fliers, though, we're fighting gravity. See what I mean?"

Jim says, "Yup. I'm not suggesting we divert resources from that work. It's important, but I'm not convinced that those efforts actually are paying off. I mean, there's not been much change in our test scores from year to year, so I don't think the evidence is there. Maybe it will materialize in the future, though."

Albert Smith, who has remained quiet throughout now speaks his piece. "I'm looking forward to reading about this idea, Jim. I know that when something bites you, it has to penetrate a pretty thick skin [this cracks his colleagues up; they've actually been feeling pretty nervous about the superintendent's enthusiasm]. And I agree with you that it's easy for a district like ours to, well, wallow in a level of complacency that's harmful to kids and teachers. And I also agree that because of this, the state could really care less about us. It's weird really—we're good enough to avoid attention and mediocre enough not to think about what's good for us. I think we need to do some more investigating

of this idea, Jim, and I'm hoping you're open to that."

Jim replies, "I sure am. I know what they say about me--hey, what you guys say about me, but I sure don't want to rush into anything; partly, yeah, because that's kind of my 'MO.' So let me back up. I gave you this damn thing to read, so read it. Find out more about the First in the World Consortium, and let's keep this stuff on the agenda. This is what I suggest. I want you to come up with suggestions for our meeting next month. I think George and Albert can work together and Frank and Andy--no reason that everyone has to do this individually. I suggest you meet once maybe and then work out your suggestions via email. And hey, if you want to dissolve your team and make your suggestions individually, I won't have a problem with that. Just gimme your ideas in writing. I'll get out a follow-up memo with the charge for this little project."

The Memo

From: Jim Blakefield
To: Secondary Principal Teams

Thanks for your willingness to help me think about adapting the "First in the World" initiative to our own circumstances in the Carter County area. I feel this effort has great potential to generate interest and progress, with your good ideas. Here are my expectations for the work of your the two teams.

The Charge: To develop ideas to adapt the First in the World concept to a consortium of districts in our region.

Particulars: (1) Research the project and its accomplishments.

(2) Identify the major features of the project and the major benefits to the

original districts.

(3) Give me your assessment of the extent you (as a team) think the project might be applicable to our region. What I want to know are the reasons you think this. Assess this with respect to the major features of the project and the major benefits in the original setting. I'm looking for a couple of pages on this, as well as your comments at the next meeting

(4) Consider that we're going to go ahead with this in some form. Give me your best thinking about where to start and why to start there. Again, write this up. A page should be enough, but I expect you to elaborate your thinking at our next meeting.

Things to Notice:

1. Carter is probably somewhat racially divided, with many Mexican-American residents.
2. Only one of the four high school principals is Mexican-American.
3. Jim Blakefiield is new to the district, a change-agent superintendent following a long-term predecessor who may have been a good steward or may have been mostly a laissez-faire "caretaker."
4. Blakefield has hired principals with academic, rather than sports, backgrounds.
5. He has discussed this idea with superintendents outside the district before bringing up the matter with anyone in-district.
6. He emphasizes competitiveness.
7. He talks about "the research base" behind the First in the World Consortium. It might be wise to examine this claim with some care.
8. Each of the principals brings differing perspectives to the table; some are better able to separate

their own experiences and concerns from the district-level issue raised by Blakefield.

9. Blakefield provides an avenue for possible influence of the principals. This could be considered authoritarian from one perspective, but participatory from another.

10. The memo elicits help with refining and implementing an idea. The principals clearly have some choices.

Journaling Questions

Question 1. Who are you?

What's been your emotional reaction to the word "globalization"? To what extent do your commitments align with the interests of corporations? With local communities? With what theories or "wordviews" can you justify these commitments? What role do you see for formal schooling in the coming century? For yourself as an educator?

Question 2: What have you read?

Think further about your encounters with "globalization" (by which we mean either the word itself, the phenomenon it represents, or the ideas and concepts associated with the it). Describe what you have read previously about colonialism or the world economic system. (Don't forget about history and geography courses you may have taken.) Describe any newspaper or news magazine articles you've read about "globalization." Whose ideas about globalization did these various encounters represent? To what extent do have you trusted the sources and why? Do an Internet search on the topic of international income inequality. What do you find?

Question 3: What do you think?

What's your reaction to the assertion that some areas of the U.S. function as internal colonies within the national economy? Describe and justify the implications of your ideas for teaching and learning in such places.

Small-Group Questions

Question: What's your input?

Form two-member teams as directed by superintendent Blakefield (three or four-member teams would be an alternative). Research the First in the World Consortium between now and the next class meeting and, following instructions in the memo, come up with the counsel Blakefield wants (see the resources below). You may invent

circumstances in surrounding districts as necessary. After a brief organizational meeting, carry on your discussions via email. You may dissolve your team and work separately if sharp ("irreconcilable") differences emerge between (or among) team members.

An important question to ask is whether or not there has been any evaluation of the FiW. Another important question to ask is why this Consortium has received so much attention. The list of citations is comparatively lengthy and the citations are found in *national-level* publications; this attention is unusual for a local project.

Resources About the First in the World Consortium

Introductory material from the FiW web page

From the FiW web page [http://www.1stintheworld.org/]: The First in the World Consortium is the product of a "study group" of North Shore superintendents. Originally this group was formed to fulfill administrative recertification requirements and, as a consequence, met regularly for several months. The dialogue at these meetings focused mostly on contemporary educational issues facing administrators at these schools, such as school financing, education and business collaboration, and educational reform. One of the last meetings of the superintendents' study group centered on Goals 2000--legislation that called for national goals and world-class standards. Few districts had attempted to address the goals, particularly the goal to achieve excellence in math and science. From this discussion of the national goals came a commitment to create a regional consortium of districts driven by the need to pursue a "world-class education" for their students.

Pledging to "take Goals 2000 seriously," the superintendents collectively decided to focus first on Goal 5--U.S. students will be first in the world in math and science achievement. This goal would become the "rallying cry" characterizing their collective effort and defining their common benchmark. The superintendents launched the consortium with the title "First in the World." While the title felt "uncomfortable," the group believed it provided the best description of the goal of their work and established a clear benchmark for accountability.

Full-text resources available online

Practitioner magazine articles (http://www.1stintheworld.org/resource.htm)

Hawkes, M., Kimmelman, P., Christensen, M., Nowakowski, J., & Marshall, S. (1997). Go for the goal. *American School Board Journal, 184*(5), 26-27, 30-31.

Hawkes, M., Kimmelman, & Kroeze, D. (1997). Becoming 'first in the World' in math and science. *Phi Delta Kappan, 79*(1), 30-33.

Kimmelman, P. (1999). Big initiatives in small places. *The School Administrator*, *56*(4), 37-40.

from the U.S. Department of Education

Kimmelman, P., Kroeze, D., Schmidt, W., van der Ploeg, A., McNeely, M., & Tan, A. (1999). *A first look at what we can learn from high performing school districts: An analysis of TIMSS data from the First in the World Consortium.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum, and Assessment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 433 243) Available online: (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/FirstLook/index.html)

from the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse

Thorson, A. (Ed.). (2000). First in the World Consortium: Superintendents lead the way for systemic change. *ENC Focus* (theme issue titled "The Reality of Change), *7*(1). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 437 287) Available online: http://www.enc.org/focus/change/documents/0,1948,FOC-000688-cd366,00.shtm

Other resources:

Bracey, G. (1998). TIMSS: The message and the myths. *Principal*, *77*(3), 18-22.

Purdom, C. (1999). First in the world: Backing a boast. *Principal*, *78*(3), 24-27.

International TIMSS web site: http://timss.bc.edu/ (retrieved July 1, 2001)

U.S. National TIMSS research website: http://ustimss.msu.edu/ (retrieved July 1, 2001)

Resources

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences.* New York: Columbia University Press.

This chapter has referenced a number of works about globalization that barely mention schooling. This is one of them. If you have to read one such book--and you should!--make it this one. For one thing, it's short (136 pages). The reason we recommend it, however, is that the subtitle ("the human consequences") makes this book extremely relevant to education. The topics and ideas that concern Bauman also concern educators, especially the topic of what kind of world we want. The first chapter, about 20 pages long, will give readers remarkable new insights about the relationship between *time* (speeded up with digital networks) and social class, as related to Bauman's notion of "localization," which is referenced so frequently in the chapter.

Ophuls, M. (Dir.). (1971). *The sorrow and the pity* [documentary film, B&W, 265 minutes].

A teacher and a principal are among the key witnesses in Ophuls's film about the Nazi occupation of France, 1940-1945. Originally produced for French television, the final cut offended the French censors and the film was banned. Most reviews call this film one of the greatest of all time. What did French officials find so distressing? The film overturns the myth that the French were united in their opposition to the Nazis; it suggests instead that they were more united in the acceptance of the invaders. Despite this overall message, it treats everyone's stories and persons with respect and dignity regardless of the role they played; people tell their own stories in their own ways, without hiding much. That candor is what's so unique in this film, and was so unsettling to officialdom. To understand the story, it helps to know something of world history up to 1940. The French empire, by the way, figures in the story. The New York Times reviewer described *The Sorrow and the Pity as* "the fastest four and a half hours in the history of cinema."

Orr, D. (1994). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect.* Washington, DC: Island Press.

The big question for this book is "What's the future outlook for humans and what can education do?" The book is comprised of about two dozen short and very readable essays on everything from "The Business of Education" to "Educating a Constituency for the Long Haul." The "earth" that the author has in mind, by the way, is the same one that globalization is remaking. David Orr is an environmental educator, and an insistent "systems thinker"; he's got a unique vision and he presents it accessibly to the average thoughtful reader. You don't need to be an economist or political scientist to read this book; it helps to be an educator, though. Orr presents a unique and compelling vision of the importance of locality, thoughtfulness, and care of the earth as part of "the commons"

(see pages 11-13 in the chapter).

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Joel Spring's is among the few books to consider education's agenda within the processes of globalization (but see also, Green, 1997). Spring weaves history, economics, and politics together in ways that make sense to educators. His histories of colonialism and imperialism are eye-openers to readers not familiar with the importance of schools to the processes of empire-building. Key chapters compare world-class educational reforms in Japan, Singapore, the European Union, and in the U.S. and United Kingdom. These are surrounded by forceful introductory and concluding chapters that treat human capital in global context and the importance of human rights as a critical educational issue.

CorpWatch's Globalization and Corporate Rule Index. (http://www.corpwatch.org/trac/globalization/)

Corporate Watch is a small group keeping tabs on the influence of transnational corporations. The group is clearly critical of this influence, but their index—a set of Web links—is among the most extensive on the Web at this writing. The site includes fact sheets on the extent of globalization, on globalization's impact on world poverty, climate and the environment, world financial institutions, and universities. There are indexes on trade agreements, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund. The site also includes an education index related to corporate influence in the public schools (http://www.igc.org/trac/feature/education/index.html).

References

Annenberg Rural Challenge. (1999). An invitation to discuss standards in public schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 15*(1), 59-63. (Also available from: http://www.ruralchallengepolicy.org/policy.html)

Appiah, K. (1998). Foreword. In S. Sassen, *Globalization and its discontents*, pp. xi-xv. New York: The New Press.

Arons, S. (1997). *A short route to chaos: Conscience, community, and the reconstitution of American schooling*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1997.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Beaumont, C., & Pianca, E. (2000). *Historic neighborhood schools in the age of sprawl: Why*

Johnny can't walk to school. Washington, D.C.: National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Beer, L. (1999, Spring). Income inequality and transnational corporate penetration. *Journal of World-Systems Research, 5*(1). Retrieved July 1, 2001, from: http://csf.colorado.edu/jwsr/archive/vol5/vol5_number1/v5n1a1.htm

Cable, V. (1996). *The world's new fissures: Identities in crisis.* London: Demos.

Clarke, T. (2001). *The emergence of corporate governance and what to do about it* [Electronic excerpt]. Retrieved July 1, 2001, from the International Forum on Globalization's web page: http://www.ifg.org/corprule.html

Clinton, W. (1999, December). *Clinton addresses the WTO.* Retrieved July 1, 2001, from the Public Broadcasting System Newshour web site: http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/international/wto/clinton_wto_12-1.html

Chubb, J., & Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Cohen, C. (1994). *Administering education in Namibia: The colonial period to the present.* Windhoek: Namibian Scientific Society.

Esteva, G., & Prakash, M. (1996). Beyond global neoliberalism to local regeneration: The international of hope. *INTERculture, 29*(2), 15-52.

Green, A. (1997). *Education, globalization, and the nation state.* New York: St. Martins Press.

Guskey, T., & Oldham, B. (1997). Despite the best intentions: Inconsistencies among components in Kentucky's systemic reform. *Educational Policy, 11*(4), 426-442.

Han, D. (2001). *The unknown cultural revolution: Educational reforms and their impact on China's rural development.* New York: Garland.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature, and the geography of difference.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Heilbroner, R., & Thurow, L. (1985). *Understanding macroeconomics* (8th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hertert, L. (1996). Systemic school reform in the 1990s: A local perspective. *Educational Policy, 10*(3), 379-398.

Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality.* New

York: Cambridge University Press.

Howley, A., & Howley, C. (1995). The power of babble: Technology and rural education. *Phi Delta Kappan, 77*(2), 126-131.

Howley, C., Howley, A., & Pendarvis, E. (1995). *Out of our minds: Anti-intellectualism and talent development in U.S. schooling*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kemmis, D. (1990). *Community and the politics of place*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Kirp, D., & Driver, C. (1995). The aspirations of systemic reform meet the realities of localism. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31*(4), 589-612.

Lasch, C. (1995). *The revolt of the elites and the betrayal of democracy*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Lomawaima, K. (1999). The Unnatural history of American Indian education. In K. Swisher and J. Tippeconnic (Eds.), *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education*, pp. 1-32. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Mathews, D. (1996). *Is there a public for public education?* Dayton, OH: Kettering Foundation Press.

McMichael, P. (1996). Globalization: Myths and realities. *Rural Sociology, 6*(1), 25-55.

Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for American from a small school in Harlem*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Michie, G. (1999). *Holler if you hear me: The education of a teacher and his students*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Milanovic, B. (1999, November). *True world income distribution, 1988 and 1993: First calculation based on household surveys alone*. Washington, DC: World Bank. (Electronic version retrieved July 1, 2001, from: http://www.worldbank.org/research/transition/abstracts/ineqtrueworld.htm)

National Center for Education Statistics. (2001). *TIMSS R-1995: More about the project*. Retrieved July 1, 2001, from: http://nces.ed.gov/timss/timss95/more.asp

National Science Foundation. (2001). *ESR systemic strategy*. Retrieved July 1, 2001, from the NSF web site: http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/esr/strategy/

New Jersey Department of Education. (1996). *New Jersey core curriculum content standards: The need* [Electronic version]. Retrieved July 1, 2001, from: http://www.state.nj.us/njded/CCC/01introneed.html

Ophuls, M. (Dir.). (1971). *The sorrow and the pity* [documentary film, B&W, 265 minutes].

Orr, D. (1994). *Earth in mind: On education, environment, and the human prospect.* Washington, DC: Island Press.

Purpel, D. (1999). *Moral outrage in education.* New York: Peter Lang.

Royal Philips Electronics. (2001). *Philips profile.* Retrieved July 1, 2001, from the Royal Philips Electronic web page: http://www.news.philips.com/profile/main.html

Sassen, S. (1996). *Losing control? Sovereignty in an age of globalization.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Soros, G. (1998). *The crisis of global capitalism: Open society endangered.* New York: BBS/PublicAffairs.

South Carolina Department of Education. (2001). *South Carolina Statewide Systemic Initiative* [Web Page]. Available Online: http://scssi.scetv.org/state/

Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Strange, M. (1988). *Family farming: A new economic vision.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Strike, K. A. (1997). Centralized goal formation and systemic reform: Reflections on liberty, localism, and pluralism. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 5*(11), 1-37. Available: http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa/v511.html

Swift, J. (1940). *Gulliver's travels: An account of the four voyages into several remote nations of the world / now written down by Jonathan Swift.* New York: The Heritage Press. (Original work published 1726)

Theobald, P. (1997). *Teaching the commons: Place, pride, and the renewal of community.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Tiller, T. (2000, May). Every other day. In J. Montgomery and A. Kitchenham (Eds.), *Proceedings of the "Rural Communities and Identities in the Global Millennium" International Conference.* Namaimo, BC: Malaspina University-College (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED ??? ??? — in process 7/1/1)

Tippeconnic, J. (1997). Tribal control of American Indian education: Observations since the 1960s with implications for the future. In K. Swisher and J. Tippeconnic (Eds.), *Next steps: Research and practice to advance Indian education*, pp. 33-52. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Weber, M. (1958). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. (Original work published 1904)

Wolff-Michael. (2001). AERA paper.

United States Deparement of Education. (1996). *Goals 2000: Educate America Act: October 1996 update*. Retrieved July 1, 2001, from the Department of Education web site: http://www.ed.gov/G2K/g2k-fact.html

Zinn, H. (1999). *A people's history of the United States: 1492-present.* New York: Harper Collins.